

Appl. No. 10/726,460
Amdt. Dated September 29, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 14, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 29 2006

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office action mailed July 14, 2006. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 32-38 remain pending in this application, with Claim 32 being the sole independent claim. Claims 32, and 34-37 have been amended herein to even more clearly recite the subject matter of the instant invention. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 32-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by and one of U.S. Patent Nos. 3,260,208 (Schluter), 3,002,459 (Harper), 3,008,417 (Keathley et al.), 3,010,400 (Guay), or 3,144,829 (Fox). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 32 now recites, *inter alia*, selectively igniting the symmetrical individual solid propellant grains in the single grain assembly from at least one of the ends in such a way that the individual solid propellant grains are consumed from the two ends in a manner that is substantially symmetrical with respect to the line.

The claims as amended make it clear that, in accordance with the methodology of the instant invention, the individual solid propellant grains of the single grain assembly burn substantially symmetrically from one or both ends. In contrast, each of the citations of record disclose, either expressly or inherently, that the grains burn from the centers of the grain assemblies outwardly.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejections.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claim 32 is patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also deemed patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

Appl. No. 10/726,460
Amdt. Dated September 29, 2006
Reply to Office Action of July 14, 2006

SEP 29 2006

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 9/29/06

By: 

Paul D. Amrozowicz
Reg. No. 45,264
(480) 385-5060